

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/800,438	03/15/2004	Jonathan W. Burks	NLL101	8951
30245	7590 . 10/04/2006	·	EXAMINER	
ANTHONY EDW. J CAMPBELL			COHEN, LEE S	
PO BOX 160370 AUSTIN, TX 78716			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
11001111, 111	,		3739	
			DATE MAIL ED. 10/04/200	,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/800,438	BURKS, JONATHAN W.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Lee S. Cohen	3739				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tirr vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	l. hely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
, , ,	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 September 2006.					
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>10-12,14,19 and 20</u> is 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-9,13 and 15-18</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	s/are withdrawn from consideration	on.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO-413)				
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/800,438 Page 2

Att Unit: 3739

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Claims 10-12, 14, 19, and 20 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made with traverse in the reply filed on September 14, 2006. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 14 and 19 have been included with the withdrawn claims since the limitations recited therein are only disclosed with the nonelected embodiment shown in upper right quadrant of Figure 5.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2, 3, 6-14, and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6, last line – "said bisecting perforation" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 7, last line – "said bisecting slit" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 16, last line – "said bisecting perforation" lacks antecedent basis. Claim 17, last line – "said bisecting slit" lacks antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Application/Control Number: 10/800,438

Art Unit: 3739

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly by Minogue (6,134,480). The disclosed assembly includes body 13 with lead attachments 18,19 inserted through holes in the body. The bottom surface includes an electrically conductive adhesive. The attachments can be metal-coated plastic (col. 3, line 9).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 8, 15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minogue (6,134,480) in view of Keusch et al (4,777,954). Minogue fails to disclose the particular material for the body and the use of a peel-off backing. Keusch et al disclose such features to be conventional in the art at column 19, lines 45-55. Accordingly, the use of these features in Minogue would have been obvious to the skilled artisan since they relate only to design expedients.

Claims 6 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minogue (6,134,480) in view of Schaefer et al (5,255,677). Minogue fails to disclose an isolation perforation or slit in the body as well as the particular shapes. Schaefer et al disclose such features (elements 42 and 56) to be well known in the art. Accordingly, the use of a perforation or slit in Minogue would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to permit separation of

Application/Control Number: 10/800,438

Art Unit: 3739

electrodes if the practitioner so desires. Further, the use of a rectangle or double square shape would also have been mere design expedients since varying shapes are disclosed by Schaefer et al.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minogue (6,134,480) in view of Keusch et al (4,777,954) as set forth supra, and further in view of Schaefer et al (5,255,677). The use of a perforation or slit as shown by Schaefer et al has been detailed supra.

Claims 1-9 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schaefer et al (5,255,677) in view of Keusch et al (4,777,954). Schaefer et al disclose the basic electrode assembly (Figures 5 and 11) including an isolation perforation or slit in the body as well as varying shapes. Schaefer et al fail to disclose the use of insertion holes with lead attachments. Keusch et al disclose such features to be conventional in the art at column 19, lines 45-55. Accordingly, the use of these features in Minogue would have been obvious to the skilled artisan since they only relate to well known electrical attachments for electrodes to transmit signals. Further, the use of a rectangle or double square shape would also have been mere design expedients since varying shapes are disclosed by Schaefer et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lee S. Cohen whose telephone number is 571-272-4763. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on 571-272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/800,438 Page 5

Art Unit: 3739

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lee S. Cohen

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3739

LSC

September 27, 2006